## 

1	Robert A. Mittelstaedt (State Bar No. 60359) ramittelstaedt@JonesDay.com Croig F. Stowart (State Bar No. 120530)		
2	Craig E. Stewart (State Bar No. 129530) cestewart@JonesDay.com		
3	JONES DAY 555 California Street, 26th Floor		
4	San Francisco, CA 94104 Telephone: (415) 626-3939		
5	Facsimile: (415) 875-5700		
6	Catherine T. Broderick (State Bar No. 25123 cbroderick@jonesday.com	31)	
7	JONES DAY 1755 Embarcadero Road		
8	Palo Alto, CA 94303 Telephone: (650) 739-3939		
9	Facsimile: (650) 739-3900		
10	Attorneys for Defendant INTUIT INC.		
11	[Additional Parties and Counsel Listed on Signature Page.]		
12	[1 Idditional I artics and Counsel Distort on Signature I age.]		
13	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
14	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
15	SAN JOSE DIVISION		
16		I	
17 18	IN RE: HIGH-TECH EMPLOYEE ANTITRUST LITIGATION	Master Docket No. 11-CV-2509-LHK	
19	THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]	
20	ALL ACTIONS	ORDER CONCERNING TESTIFYING EXPERT DISCOVERY	
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
		STIPULATION CONCERN	

STIPULATION CONCERNING TESTIFYING EXPERT DISCOVERY MASTER DOCKET NO. 11-CV-2509-LHK

1 STIPULATION CONCERNING TESTIFYING EXPERT DISCOVERY The parties stipulate to the following regarding the scope of testifying expert discovery in 2 the above-captioned matter: 3 1. This Stipulation And Order Concerning Testifying Expert Discovery 4 5 ("Stipulation") will govern discovery from testifying experts in the above-captioned matter. 6 Subject to the limitations herein, the parties shall comply with Rule 26(a) of the Federal Rules of 7 Civil Procedure. To the extent that this Stipulation imposes limitations on discovery which 8 otherwise would be available under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the parties have agreed 9 to any such limitations. Neither the terms of the Stipulation nor the parties' agreement to them 10 shall be considered an admission by any person that any of the information restricted from 11 discovery by this Stipulation would otherwise be discoverable or admissible. 2. 12 The following types of information shall not be the subject of discovery by 13 subpoena, deposition or otherwise: 14 a. the content of communications among and between: 15 i. counsel and testifying expert witnesses; 16 testifying expert witnesses and their respective staffs; ii. 17 testifying expert witnesses and consultants; iii. 18 iv. communications among or between testifying expert witnesses; and 19 b. notes, drafts, written communications, preliminary or intermediate 20 calculations, computations or other data runs, or other types of preliminary 21 work created by, for, or at the direction of testifying expert witnesses. 3. 22 The protections against discovery contained in the preceding paragraph shall not apply to any communications or documents upon which a testifying expert relies as a basis for 23 24 any of his or her opinions or reports. 25 Consented and agreed to by the following parties: 26 27

28

## 

1	Dated: December 5, 2011	LIEFF, CABRASER, HEIMANN & BERNSTEIN, LLP
2		
3		By: <u>/s/ Joseph R. Saveri</u> JOSEPH R. SAVERI
4		Interim Lead Counsel for Plaintiffs and the Proposed Class
5		
6	Dated: December 5, 2011	O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP
7		By: /s/Michael F. Tubach
8		MICHAEL F. TUBACH Attorneys for Defendant
9		APPLE INC.
10	Dated: December 5, 2011	KEKER & VAN NEST LLP
11		
12		By: <u>/s/ Daniel Purcell</u> DANIEL PURCELL
13		Attorneys for Defendant LUCASFILM LTD.
14		
15	Dated: December 5, 2011	JONES DAY
16		By: /s/ David C. Kiernan
17		DAVID C. KIERNAN Attorneys for Defendant
18		ADOBE SYSTEMS INC.
19	Dated: December 5, 2011	MAYER BROWN LLP
20	,	
21		By: <u>/s/ Lee H. Rubin</u> LEE H. RUBIN
22		Attorneys for Defendant GOOGLE INC.
23		GOOGLE INC.
24	Dated: December 5, 2011	BINGHAM McCUTCHEN LLP
25		By: /s/ Zachany I Alindar
26		By: /s/ Zachery J. Alinder ZACHERY J. ALINDER Attorneys for Defendant INTEL CORPORATION
27		INTEL CORTORATION
28		
		- 2 - STIPULATION CONCERNING TESTIFYING EXPERT DISCOVERY

## 

1	Dated: December 5, 2011 JO	NES DAY	
2			
3	Ву	: <u>/s/ Robert A. Mittelstaedt</u> ROBERT A. MITTELSTAEDT	
4		Attorneys for Defendant INTUIT INC.	
5			
6	Dated: December 5, 2011 CO	OVINGTON & BURLING LLP	
7	By	:/s/ Emily Johson Henn	
8		EMILY JOHNSON HENN Attorneys for Defendant	
9		PIXAR	
10			
11	FILER'S ATTESTATION		
12	Pursuant to General Order No. 45, § X(B), I attest under penalty of perjury that concurrence in		
13	the filing of the document has been obtained from all the signatories.		
14			
15	Dated: December 5, 2011 By	: <u>/s/ Catherine T. Broderick</u> CATHERINE T. BRODERICK	
16			
17			
18	PURSUANT TO STIPULATION	, IT IS SO ORDERED.	
19			
20	Dated:		
21		Honorable Lucy H. Koh United States District Judge	
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
		- 3 - STIPULATION CONCERNING	